

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

SKAT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BLACKRAIN PEGASUS LLC SOLO 401K
PLAN & DOSTON BRADLEY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. _____

Honorable _____

June 8, 2018

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff SKAT, which is the Customs and Tax Administration of the Kingdom of Denmark, by and through the undersigned counsel, alleges against Defendants Blackrain Pegasus LLC Solo 401K Plan (“**Blackrain**”) and Doston Bradley (“**Bradley**”) as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff SKAT is the agency of the government of Denmark charged with the assessment and collection of Danish taxes.

2. This case stems from a fraudulent tax refund scheme to deceive SKAT into paying out over 12.7 billion Danish Kroner (“**DKK**”), the equivalent of approximately \$2.1 billion (US), of allegedly withheld dividend tax.

3. The essence of the fraudulent scheme is that each of over 300 entities pretended to own shares in Danish companies listed on the OMX Copenhagen 20 Index, the 20 most-traded stocks in Denmark. The Danish companies are required to withhold 27% tax on dividends they

pay to shareholders. Under certain double taxation treaties between Denmark and other countries, including the United States, this tax is reimbursable to non-Danish shareholders.

4. The entities, acting through their agents and representatives, applied to SKAT claiming repayments of tax withheld on dividends that they purported to have earned on shares of Danish companies. These applications were fraudulent because the claimants did not own the shares that they claimed to own, they did not earn the dividends they claimed to have earned, and they were not entitled to the tax refunds they claimed.

5. The claimants effectuated the scheme by appointing agents to apply to SKAT for refunds in respect of shares in Danish companies that they did not own. The agents submitted the fraudulent applications at the direction of, and on behalf of, the claimants, with false documentation representing that the claimants owned substantial shares in Danish companies, had earned substantial dividends for which tax had been withheld, and other documentation representing that the claimants were entitled to a tax refund. The agents obtained over \$2.1 billion in refunds from SKAT, and distributed the proceeds of the scheme to the claimants and other participants in the fraud. During the period of 2012 to 2015, SKAT received fraudulent requests for tax refunds from several agents on behalf of 277 pension plans in the United States, including Defendant Blackrain, as well as entities in the United Kingdom, Canada, Malaysia, and Luxembourg.

6. On June 15, 2015, SKAT received information indicating that certain claimants may have submitted fraudulent tax refund claims based on the double taxation treaty between Denmark and Malaysia. Based on this information, SKAT undertook an investigation and subsequently discovered that the claimants had submitted requests for tax refunds by misrepresenting that they owned shares in Danish companies, that they had earned substantial

dividend income on their shares, and that they were entitled to refunds of tax withheld in respect of those dividends. Through its investigation, SKAT discovered that these representations were false: the claimants did not own the shares and they were not entitled to a refund of withholding tax.

7. As a result of these false claims, the claimants and their agents received cash payments of what were supposed to be “refunds” of tax to which they were not entitled. During the course of its investigation, SKAT also learned that the scheme involved entities and individuals not just in Malaysia, but also in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Luxembourg.

8. On or about August 24, 2015, SKAT stopped paying all claims for refunds of dividend withholding tax while it investigated the fraudulent scheme. At the same time, SKAT reported the alleged fraud to the Danish Public Prosecutor for Serious Economic and International Crime (“SØIK”). The fraudulent scheme is currently under investigation by law enforcement authorities in Denmark, the United Kingdom, Germany, and other jurisdictions. At least three individuals have been criminally charged by SØIK.

9. The claimants obtained substantial assistance in the fraudulent scheme from several other entities and individuals, including:

a. The Authorized Representatives of the claimants, such as Defendant Bradley, who, among other things, executed at the direction of, and on behalf of, the claimants documents authorizing the Payment Agents to submit the claimants’ tax refund claims and to receive from SKAT payments in respect of those claims;

b. The non-party Payment Agents, which are companies that submitted fraudulent tax refund claims to SKAT at the direction of, and on behalf of, the claimants; and

c. The non-party Broker-Custodians, which are financial institutions that provided statements falsely representing that the claimants owned shares in Danish companies and had earned dividends on those shares.

10. The Defendants did know or should have known that these arrangements would cause SKAT to make payments to which the Defendants were not entitled.

11. SKAT made all the payments to the claimants' Payment Agents, which, on information and belief, distributed the proceeds to other participants in the fraud, including the claimants and the Authorized Representatives.

12. As a result of the overall fraudulent scheme, SKAT paid baseless withholding tax refund claims of approximately \$2.1 billion (US).

13. As a result of the fraudulent claims by the Defendants in this action, SKAT paid baseless withholding tax refund claims and was damaged in the amount of at least \$5,558,000 (US)¹, plus interest.

II. JURISDICTION & VENUE

14. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(4), this Court has jurisdiction over all claims because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state and citizens of a state or of different states.

1. This amount is the result of a conversion from DKK to U.S. Dollars performed on June 1, 2018, utilizing a conversion rate of 1 U.S. Dollar to 6.3861 DKK.

15. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District. In the alternative, venue is proper because at least one of the Defendants is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court.

III. PARTIES

16. Plaintiff SKAT is the Danish national agency charged with assessing and collecting taxes. SKAT is located at Østbanegade 123, 2200 København Ø, Denmark. During the period material to the events described in this Complaint, SKAT used a mailing address of Skatteceter Høje-Taastrup, Postboks 60, DK-2630 Taastrup, Denmark.

17. Defendant Blackrain is a pension plan, which, in its requests to SKAT for tax refunds, listed its address as 16546 Mediterranean Street, Crosby, Texas 77532, United States. On information and belief, each member of Defendant Blackrain is a citizen of a state of the United States. At all times material to the allegations in this Complaint, Defendant Blackrain purported to be a trust forming part of a pension, profit sharing, or stock bonus plan qualified under section 401(a) of the United States Internal Revenue Code, exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the United States Internal Revenue Code, and resident of the United States of America for purposes of U.S. taxation.

18. Defendant Bradley is a citizen of a state of the United States. At all times material to the allegations in this Complaint, Bradley served as the Authorized Representative for Defendant Blackrain.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The Danish Withholding Tax System

19. Withholding tax is a common fiscal device by which taxes are deducted at the source by a payer of income, and are reported to the relevant tax authority. In this case, the relevant tax authority is SKAT.

20. Under the Danish Withholding Tax Act section 65, Danish companies are required to withhold 27% of the dividend distributed as to their shares.

21. Foreign shareholders may be entitled to a refund if the withheld tax exceeds the amount of tax owed according to a double taxation treaty between Denmark and the shareholder's country of residence.

22. A double taxation treaty between Denmark and the United States² allows for refund of tax withheld on dividends paid by Danish companies to U.S. pension plans, which are exempt from taxation.

23. SKAT paid claims for refunds of dividend withholding tax made by claimants who represented that they had shareholdings in Danish companies and that they had received dividends on those shareholdings net of the tax. The claimants submitted refund claims seeking the full 27% withholding tax that had allegedly been withheld from distributions on shares that the claimants purported to own.

24. It was SKAT's normal practice to accept claims from designated payment agents and to transmit refunds to claimants through their designated payment agents.

B. The Fraudulent Scheme

25. As a result of its investigation, SKAT has now determined that, during the period 2012 through 2015, it received fraudulent dividend withholding tax refund claims as part of a scheme involving (i) a pension plan or other claimant, (ii) an Authorized Representative, (iii) a Payment Agent, and (iv) a Broker-Custodian. The respective roles of each of these participants are described in further detail in paragraphs 32 through 51 below.

2. Convention and Protocol between the United States and Denmark for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, U.S.-Den., art. 10, ¶ 2(c), May 6, 1948, S. Treaty Doc. No. 106-12 (effective date Jan. 1, 2001).

1. The Fraudulent Refund Claims Process

26. The claimants submitted fraudulent claims to SKAT through Payment Agents, including non-party Acupay System LLC (“**Acupay**”), each of which submitted claims by mail or by email transmissions.

27. The claimants received payments with respect to their refund claims from their designated Payment Agents, to which SKAT transmitted payment by bank transfer.

28. Each of the claimants provided the following documentation to SKAT through their designated agents:

a. a short cover letter, printed on a Payment Agent’s letterhead and addressed to SKAT in Taastrup, Denmark;

b. a SKAT “Claim to Relief from Danish Dividend Tax” form (the “**Claim Form**”), which set out:

i. the identity of the claimant representing that it owned the relevant shares and had received dividends net of withholding tax;

ii. the amount of the tax refund claim;

iii. a certification that the claimant was covered by the relevant double taxation treaty between Denmark and the country in which the claimant was resident; and

iv. the bank account to which SKAT should pay the claim;

c. a “credit advice” note purporting to describe the shareholding (or security) and the amount of dividend tax withheld;

d. a signed Power of Attorney, by which the claimant’s Authorized Representative appointed a Payment Agent to act on behalf of the stated claimant; and

e. in respect of United States-based pension plans, a statement from the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”), certifying that each pension plan was (I) a trust forming part of a pension, profit sharing, or stock bonus plan qualified under section 401(a) of the United States Internal Revenue Code (the “Code”), (II) exempt from U.S. taxation under section 501(a) of the Code, and (III) resident in the United States for purposes of United States taxation.

29. The fraudulent claims alleged shareholdings in some of the largest Danish listed companies belonging to the OMX Copenhagen 20 Index in Denmark.

30. It was SKAT’s practice to pay claims that included the required supporting documentation.

31. SKAT made payments by bank transfer to the Payment Agents for the benefit of the claimants.

2. The Role of the Claimants

32. Out of the over 300 claimants that SKAT has, to date, determined were participants in the fraudulent scheme, 277 were in the United States.

33. Each of the claimants, including Defendant Blackrain, made withholding tax refund claims through their Payment Agents, as described in paragraph 28, above.

34. As part of the fraudulent claims, each of the Authorized Representatives confirmed to SKAT that they were agents of the claimants and were authorized to act on behalf of the claimants with respect to the dividend withholding tax refund claims. Defendant Blackrain represented that Defendant Bradley was its Authorized Representative and agent who had authority to act on its behalf with respect to Defendant Blackrain’s claims.

35. As part of their fraudulent claims, each of the claimants designated one of the Payment Agents as its agent to act on behalf of that claimant with respect to the claim.

Defendant Blackrain represented that non-party Acupay was its agent and had authority to act on its behalf with respect to its claims.

36. Each of the claimants represented to SKAT that they held shares in, and received dividends net of withholding tax from, large Danish listed companies. Defendant Blackrain made thirteen (13) separate withholding tax refund claims, and represented that it was entitled to refunds totaling at least \$5,558,000 (US). These refund claims were submitted to SKAT on the following dates: January 28, 2014; March 31, 2014; April 17, 2014; May 27, 2014; and September 4, 2014.

37. In fact, Defendant Blackrain did not hold the shares it represented to SKAT that it owned, and had no dividend tax withheld.

38. Based on the false refund claims listed in paragraph 36, SKAT made payments to Defendant Blackrain on the following dates: February 7, 2014; May 9, 2014; May 28, 2014; July 3, 2014; October 9, 2014.

3. The Role of the Claimants' Authorized Representatives

39. Each Authorized Representative executed at the direction of, and on behalf of, the claimant for which he or she was the Authorized Representative a form entitled "Power of Attorney." By the Power of Attorney, the claimant, acting through its respective Authorized Representative, granted the Payment Agent authority to act on behalf of the claimant.

40. Defendant Bradley executed at the direction of, and on behalf of, Defendant Blackrain a "Special Power of Attorney" dated December 16, 2013, that granted to non-party Acupay authority "to pursue and file for reductions in rates of tax withholding in [Blackrain's] name for which [Blackrain is] eligible, to oversee this process, and to collect refunds of excess withholding tax to which [Blackrain is] entitled on [Blackrain's] behalf." Defendant Bradley described himself as the "Co-Trustee" of Defendant Blackrain.

41. Defendant Bradley signed Power of Attorney documents as the Authorized Representative for at least 20 of the 277 U.S. entities that pretended to own shares in Danish companies listed on the OMX Copenhagen 20 Index and that fraudulently requested tax refunds from SKAT, including Defendant Blackrain. In addition to signing the “Limited Power of Attorney” document for Defendant Blackrain on or about December 16, 2013, Defendant Bradley also signed such Power of Attorney documents for at least three other claimants on or about the same day.

42. In addition to Defendant Blackrain, Defendant Bradley signed as Authorized Representative for at least four other claimants which, in their requests to SKAT for tax refunds, also listed an address of 16546 Mediterranean Street, Crosby, Texas 77532.

4. The Role of the Payment Agents

43. The Payment Agents submitted the fraudulent withholding tax refund claims at the direction of the claimants and Authorized Representatives and on behalf of the claimants.

44. By means of the Power of Attorney described in paragraphs 39-40 above, each claimant authorized its respective Payment Agent to act on behalf of and subject to control of the claimant with respect to submitting the withholding tax refund claims.

45. With each claim, the Payment Agents submitted substantially similar cover letters attaching the documentation described in paragraph 28 above.

46. In connection with each Claim Form, the Payment Agent:

- a. provided its email address as the contact address for the claimant on whose behalf it was acting;
- b. signed and stamped the form, and stated it was applying on behalf of the claimant;

c. enclosed the Power of Attorney executed by the claimant's Authorized Representative; and

d. requested that SKAT pay the claim to its bank account.

47. As per the directions included in the submission to SKAT, the Payment Agents received payment of the refunds from SKAT on behalf of the claimants. On information and belief, the Payment Agents subsequently distributed the proceeds to the claimants and other participants in the fraud, including the Authorized Representatives, and the Payment Agents themselves.

5. The Role of the Broker-Custodians

48. Each entity claiming a withholding tax refund submitted to SKAT a “credit advice,” “income advice,” “tax voucher” or similar document from a Broker-Custodian that purported to show the claimant’s ownership of shares in Danish companies listed on the OMX Copenhagen 20 Index.

49. By way of example, with respect to Defendant Blackrain, one example of a “credit advice”:

a. is made out by Solo Capital Partners LLP;

b. is dated August 13, 2014;

c. purports to certify Defendant Blackrain’s ownership of 2,874,352 shares in TDC A/S (a genuine company), and whose shares were (and are) publicly traded on the OMX Copenhagen 20 Index in Denmark; and

d. states an International Securities Identification Number (“**ISIN**”) for TDC A/S shares as “DK0060228559”. An ISIN is a twelve-character alpha-numeric code that uniquely identifies securities for trading and settlement purposes.

50. Defendant Blackrain never owned the shares described above, never received any dividend from Danish companies in which it was a purported shareholder and was not entitled to claim a refund of dividend withholding tax.

51. In the course of its investigation, in or around August 2015, SKAT concluded that many of the withholding tax refund claims that had been made in the preceding years, including claims by Defendant Blackrain, were fraudulent and SKAT suspended further payments.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

(Fraud – Against Both Defendants)

52. SKAT repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 51 above as if fully set forth herein.

53. Defendants intentionally, knowingly and/or recklessly made or caused to be made the material, false and fraudulent statements described in paragraphs 28-29, 36 and 48 through 50 to support claims for withholding tax refund payments.

54. Defendants intentionally, knowingly, and/or recklessly made or caused to be made these false and fraudulent statements to induce SKAT to pay the claims.

55. In reliance on the false and fraudulent misrepresentations, SKAT paid baseless withholding tax refund claims of at least \$5,558,000 (US) and thereby suffered damages of that amount, plus interest.

56. Defendants' extensive fraudulent conduct demonstrates a high degree of moral turpitude and wanton dishonesty, entitling SKAT to punitive damages.

COUNT II

(Aiding and Abetting Fraud – Against Both Defendants)

57. SKAT repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 56 above as if fully set forth herein.

58. As alleged above, a massive fraud was perpetrated on SKAT by the claimants, the Authorized Representatives, the Payment Agents, and/or other non-parties.

59. As alleged in paragraphs 25 through 50 above, the Defendants, with knowledge, participated in the massive fraud on SKAT.

60. The Defendants acted with knowledge, willful blindness, and/or recklessness in submitting claims for refunds of dividend withholding tax to SKAT with knowledge that they were not entitled to receive any refunds.

61. The Defendants intentionally furthered the fraud and substantially assisted the fraud through their conduct described in paragraphs 25 through 50 above.

62. As a direct and natural cause of the Defendants' aiding and abetting of the fraudulent scheme, SKAT has suffered substantial damages.

63. Defendants' extensive fraudulent conduct demonstrates a high degree of moral turpitude and wanton dishonesty, entitling SKAT to punitive damages.

COUNT III

(Money Had & Received – Against Both Defendants)

64. SKAT repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 63 above as if fully set forth herein.

65. As a result of their fraudulent scheme, Defendants received proceeds from withholding tax refunds to which they were not entitled.

66. It is against equity and good conscience to permit Defendants to keep these monies, and they should account for and pay to SKAT the amount of withholding tax refund payments they received to which they were not entitled, plus interest.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff SKAT requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor against Defendants as follows:

1. For Counts I and II, for fraud and aiding and abetting fraud, the damages sustained by SKAT as a result of the Defendants' wrongful acts, plus pre-judgment interest, fees, costs and expenses.
2. For Count III, for money had and received, the damages sustained or the amounts by which the Defendants received money to which they were not entitled, plus pre-judgment interest, fees, costs and expenses.
3. For Counts I and II, punitive damages.
4. The costs of this action.
5. All other and further relief that is just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff SKAT demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARK HILL STRASBURGER



MICHAEL A. WALSH

Attorney-in-Charge

Texas State Bar No. 00790146

S.D. Texas Bar No. 21846

Courtney Jones Kieffer

Texas State Bar No. 24007457

S.D. Texas Bar No. 3207613

Elizabeth F. Griffin

Texas State Bar No. 24092450

S.D. Texas Bar No. 3228156

901 Main Street, Suite 6000

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 651-4300

Telecopier: (214) 651-4330

michael.walsh@clarkhillstrasburger.com

courtney.kieffer@clarkhillstrasburger.com

elizabeth.griffin@clarkhillstrasburger.com

Counsel for Plaintiff SKAT (Customs and Tax
Administration of the Kingdom of Denmark)

OF COUNSEL:

HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP

s/ Sarah. L. Cave

William R. Maguire

Marc A. Weinstein

Sarah L. Cave

John T. McGoey

One Battery Park Plaza

New York, New York 10004-1482

(212) 837-6000 (t)

(212) 422-4726 (f)

Bill.maguire@hugheshubbard.com

Marc.weinstein@hugheshubbard.com

Sarah.cave@hugheshubbard.com

John.mcgoey@hugheshubbard.com

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

SKAT

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff N/A
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
Michael A. Walsh; Clark Hill Strasburger
901 Main Street, Suite, 6000, Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 651-4300

DEFENDANTS

Blackrain Pegasus LLC Solo 401K Plan & Boston Bradley

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Harris
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
<input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability		<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment
<input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument	<input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	<input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability		<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust
<input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud		<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking
<input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending		<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	<input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage		<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation
<input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability		<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
<input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits	<input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Other Fraud		<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit
<input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending		<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV
<input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage		<input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
<input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise		<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability		<input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	SOCIAL SECURITY	<input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)	<input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters
<input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting	<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee	<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)	<input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	<input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration
<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land	<input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations	<input type="checkbox"/> 530 General	<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI	<input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure
<input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
<input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	Other:		<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	<input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition		
		<input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		
			FEDERAL TAX SUITS	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	
			IMMIGRATION	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application	
			<input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 Original Proceeding	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Removed from State Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Reinstated or Reopened	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
---	---	--	---	--	--	---

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 U.S.C. 1332(a)(4)

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Brief description of cause:
Fraudulent tax refund scheme involving Danish dividend taxes reimbursed to Texas pension plan

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION
UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

5,558,000.00

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

06/08/2018

/s/ Michael A. Walsh

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE